

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

VOL. VIII

NEW YORK, MAY 8, 1915

No. 26

A few years ago it would have seemed utterly absurd to assert that the 'Movies' could be a valuable aid to the Classics. Even now there are teachers who have not realized just what use they can make of these shows. It may therefore be worth while to state what the nature and the importance of our opportunity are and what the individual teacher can do to avail himself of it. Moving pictures are an excellent means of showing that the Classics are not dead. The classical teacher not only makes Latin and Greek alive, but makes the Greeks and Romans seem like living beings (if he does not do so, he should). He contributes matters of lively interest to the life of to-day and he draws on the same life to make his subject alive. The circle is perfect. Here is where the cinematograph plays its part. For years teachers have had their students read such novels as Davis's *A Friend of Caesar*, Bulwer-Lytton's *Last Days of Pompeii*, etc.¹ Occasionally they may have had the opportunity of recommending, if they cared to, a play like *Quo Vadis* performed by a mediocre company and poorly staged. Now come the moving pictures, which penetrate to all parts of the country and offer splendid pictures at small cost. An institution which seems to some only an evil may be turned into useful channels. I have heard several teachers complaining that their students do no work because they are at the 'Movies' much of the time after School hours. This is undoubtedly true and will remain true. There is no question that the cinematograph is to become an even more important factor in our civilization than it is. I refer here not so much to the use of 'educational' films in Schools, Churches, etc., as to the exhibitions given in theaters for commercial gain. As classical teachers, let us seize an opportunity.

There are, to my knowledge, now available seven pretentious spectacles of particular interest to the classicist. They run from over an hour to two hours and a quarter in length. The price of admission to most of these spectacles is higher than to the ordinary exhibitions, usually being about 25 cents. All have been brought out since the summer of 1913, the latest having been released in the last few months. All but one were produced in Italy. I understand that others are in preparation. The seven are *Quo Vadis*, *Spartacus*, *The Last Days of Pompeii*, *Antony and Cleopatra*,

Julius Caesar, *Cabiria*, *Damon and Pythias*. It is true that these plays are not all that we should like them to be. There is much of the sensational—often so much that one can not but laugh at it—and much that is inaccurate, but on the whole they are worth while, and one should not hesitate to make use of them.

Perhaps the most interesting as an aid to High School Latin is *Julius Caesar*. It is not a presentation of Shakespeare's drama, though Shakespeare is utilized here and there. It is not a drama in the ordinary sense at all, but a dramatic biography of Julius Caesar from the years of his youth, when he fell in love with Cornelia, down to Antony's eulogy. Thus it is all the more useful for educational purposes. Of particular interest to students of Caesar's Commentaries are the scenes in Gaul, and to students of Cicero the scenes in the senate. There are, of course, inaccuracies in this production; in fact they are very numerous and varied—from Roman soldiers with moustaches (they are so few, however, that it is clear that the director knew better) to a *J* instead of an *I* in an inscription. But when we consider the enormous difficulties, it must be admitted that the work has been very well done. Twenty thousand persons are said to have taken part in this spectacle. The following interesting details are taken from a prospectus:

A miniature city of Rome was built covering a space equivalent to six square city blocks. Eight cars of concrete were used in the construction of a Gallic fortress which Caesar's army storms and destroys. Two hundred carpenters and stone masons, eighty stage carpenters and their assistants, twenty seamstresses, twelve motion picture directors and two professors of archaeology found employment at one time or another during the eighteen months of preparation. . . .

Each chair, desk, stylus, every bit of statuary and even the ornamental decoration of the doors and walls had to be historically accurate. These things were the work of not one but many minds. Several well-known Parisian authorities on antiquities were hired to supervise the detail of the sketches and their word was law. Nearly all the interiors contain statuary. As a matter of fact, there are several hundred bust figures of solid marble used, and as a lapse of some thirty-eight years is covered by the story, it was one of the many details to see that the marble figure of some famous Roman did not appear in a scene in which the action was presumed to take place at a date prior to his birth. . . .

When the costumes had all been made, the scenery built and painted, and everything was in readiness, a corps of men was engaged to scour Rome for unemployed men and women to fill the "mob" scenes.

¹Compare the paper by Professor F. S. Dunn, *The Historical Novel in the Classroom*, in *The Classical Journal* 6.296-304.

It is no wonder then that the hair of an occasional Roman is combed in a decidedly unroman fashion! The difficulties of producing such a work are as unexpected as they are numerous; for example,

In the senate chamber after Caesar's death, several hundred senators are seized with panic and rush madly through a corridor about twenty feet wide. Of course all these senators wear their togas, and to spring up suddenly and run with those long, white garments trailing about their feet makes an accident insurance policy desirable. Invariably in the rehearsals some one would trip and a crowd of dignified Roman senators would pile up behind him. To lift the gowns up around their waists and run seemed the only logical thing to do, and I doubt not that the senators did that very sensible thing when the assassination actually occurred, but of course we couldn't do that without utterly ruining the gravity of the scene.

Of the other plays, *Cabiria*, written by the well-known D'Annunzio, is one of the most elaborate. The historical setting is that of the Second Punic War. Hannibal crossing the Alps and Scipio in Africa are among the scenes. Archimedes, the famous Greek philosopher, is shown using his burning machine against the Roman fleet. One of the many interesting and instructive scenes is the siege of a city, with a fine representation of a *testudo* in action.

The Last Days of Pompeii and Quo Vadis are dramatizations of the novels by Bulwer-Lytton and Sienkiewicz. Many of the inaccuracies in these plays are of course due to the authors themselves. The former was made at Pompeii and the latter at Rome. Quo Vadis, it is said, has probably been shown in practically every town of three thousand or more inhabitants in the United States. Antony and Cleopatra tells the story of the lovers from their first meeting to their deaths. The pictures were taken at Rome and Alexandria.

Of Damon and Pythias, the latest of these plays to be released, the Independent for January 11, 1915, says:

The story of Damon and Pythias as presented in the photoplay is ingeniously introduced by taking us first through Athens as it now is and showing us the ruins of the Acropolis, the Temple of Vulcan, Erechtheum, the Parthenon, the Theater of Dionysus, tinged by the glow of the southern sunset. Then in a flash we are transported to classic Greece in the days of her splendor The grouping and costuming are admirably handled and southern California makes a very acceptable substitute for Greece as a setting.

Some of the advertising matter used for these plays is distinctly commendable. For example, the press matter for Quo Vadis includes good discussions on Did Nero Burn Rome and Why Nero Tortured Christians, as well as a translation of a passage from Petronius's *Cena Trimalchionis*.

There are two ways in which these plays may be made available to students. The films may be rented directly and shown at a special performance, or steps may be taken to have them put on for the general public in a theater. The former method is as yet rarely possible (unless a hall or theater is rented), because few Schools are provided with the necessary apparatus,

though the time is coming when it will be quite as common as stereopticons now are. It is easier, then, to depend on the public theaters. One may write to the companies controlling the films to find out whether the desired play is booked for the town in which the School is located. If it is not booked, the matter may be taken up with the company or a local theater. For the first five plays mentioned above, address George Kleine, 166 N. State St., Chicago; for *Cabiria*, address Itala Film Co., 210 W. 40th St., New York; for *Damon and Pythias*, address Universal Film Manufacturing Co., 1600 Broadway, New York.

Such plays as these are most profitable if they can be accompanied by intelligent comment. Failing this, the teacher may prepare his students by preliminary talks, or the Classical Club of the School, if there be one, may devote several meetings to topics suggested by the play.

By being instrumental in bringing plays of this sort to his community, the teacher is doing a great service, since many of the general public will attend and find a higher form of entertainment than usual. At the same time the cause of the Classics will be greatly benefited, for the people as a whole will become familiar with classical life and history. It is to the advantage of the Classics that these plays be seen by the greatest possible number of persons, and that more and more plays of this sort be produced. The claim is made that, wherever such plays are produced, interest in the history of the period is stimulated and is reflected in the demands made on public libraries. This is an interesting field for investigation. Probably the Schools are partly responsible for the demands on the libraries. The Independent for January 11 says:

The classicists have a new ally. They have labored in vain to get the public to listen to them when they lectured about Odysseus, Hannibal, Caesar, Cleopatra, Damon, and Pythias, but now people are flocking by the thousand to the theater to see what they would not read or hear about in the classroom. Teachers may now be seen on a Saturday afternoon leading school-boys who have refused to be driven.

We have then in such plays the finest kind of 'Publicity for the Classics'.

B. L. U.

A PLEA FOR THE REORGANIZATION OF THE WORK IN LATIN COMPOSITION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS¹

In the curricula of Secondary Schools there is at present no one subject presenting problems with such widely varying factors as Latin composition, and great difficulty is created in this work by lack of clearness in the statements of College requirements. A close study of the examination papers in Latin Composition issued

¹Compare The Classical Journal 10.267.

²This paper was read as part of a Symposium on The Reorganization of Secondary Latin held at the College of the City of New York, in November last; see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 7. 48, 72. The other papers then presented, with additional matter on this theme, will appear early in Volume 9 of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY. C. K.

by the larger Colleges in the last five years, together with the requirements stated in their respective registers, shows that, in the use of the general terms Elementary Composition and Advanced Composition, there is practically no dividing line, even approximate, in the subject-matter which must be presented. Consequently, in a class in Second Year Latin, the teacher frequently finds it necessary to pursue a course which will prepare the pupils for examinations to be taken in some cases at the end of that year, in other cases after completing Cicero, and in a few cases even as a final examination. There is, therefore, great confusion at present in the status of composition, great need of uniformity, and an even greater need of specifically defined limits, inclusive or exclusive, to the scope of grammar involved in the several stages of this work, especially in the work of the first two years, i. e. through Caesar.

The text-books in Latin composition now on the market do not indicate any clear divisions of subject-matter. In one published recently the author states his object to be "to combine a thorough and systematic study of the essentials of Latin syntax with abundant practice in translating English into Latin". This ideal in one form or another is undoubtedly the aim of every writer of composition books, and is naturally the desire of every teacher of the subject. To this end there are various methods in use: some endeavor to accomplish it by exercises based directly upon the text read in the class, others by developing ability to handle grammatical principles through a systematic treatment of topics independent of the other work of the class. But "thorough and systematic study of the essentials of Latin syntax with abundant practice in writing", while logical as a requirement viewed from the standpoint of the Colleges, and highly ideal as the aim of the Secondary Schools, presents insurmountable difficulties so long as the present requirements exist for that stage of preparatory Latin known as Latin A, or Second Year Latin—Latin through Caesar.

There is one condition absolutely essential to the reorganization of composition work, whereby the subject may be placed upon a reasonable and hopeful basis for all pupils: this indispensable condition is, that we shall have the entire field of Latin composition placed upon a *graded scale*, with clearly defined scope of both vocabulary and grammatical material. This scale may be in either two or three steps, without presenting difficulties to the teacher, provided that each step has its own limits sharply defined. This definiteness of statement is just what the College registers do not give, and what the text-books now on the market carefully avoid, or even thoroughly confuse.

A Latin composition examination should be, for the Colleges, a test of the pupil's ability to transfer a thought expressed in his own language into the equivalent expression for the same thought in the Latin language; it should *not* be a test of the student's knowledge of forms as such, or of case and mood constructions as

such, points appertaining strictly to an examination in grammar itself. If College examinations are truly a test of the pupil's qualifications for work in College, they may very properly present searching questions in some subjects, but in an examination in Latin A, and even in Latin B, examinations taken in most cases at least one or two years before the pupil is ready for College, the requirements should not be so complex and ramified. Many such examinations merely test the success of the Secondary Schools in covering an enormous field of work with just sufficient thoroughness in points wisely selected for emphasis to enable the student to attain a meager fifty or sixty percent grade. The examinations are often a test of the driving power of the schoolmaster, not a test of the student's real appreciation of the principles of the Latin language.

Few Secondary Schools give, or indeed *can* give, more than one recitation period per week to composition. From all sides comes the cry that one period is insufficient, but that more time cannot be spared from the work in text. Elementary text-books in composition cover practically the entire range of grammatical constructions used in Caesar, including independent subjunctives, periphrastic forms, unreal conditions in indirect discourse, provisos, passive of intransitive verbs, gerundive uses with *utor*, etc., and the many confusing constructions after verbs of all sorts—doubting, hindering, feeling, fearing, lacking, accusing, remembering, etc., etc. How can this ground be covered successfully, or even approximately, in thirty-odd periods with pupils so immature and language-weak as second year students? Schools which can give three years to preparation for the first examination have much better hope of success, but even in that case valuable time and energy must be dissipated over an almost hopeless mass of material.

The chief distinction between Elementary and Advanced Composition as evidenced in the College examination papers is: Caesar's vocabulary rather than Cicero's, and sentences on the one paper expressed in slightly less complex English than the sentences on the more advanced paper. How slight this distinction is may be seen in the following sentences taken from papers issued by the same College under the same date. On a paper which covers Second Year Latin a sentence reads: "If the Roman army had not conquered Ariovistus, in a few years all the Germans would have crossed the Rhine". On the other paper, on Cicero, we find: "If the senate had ordered Antonius to remain in his province, the republic would have been saved". Both sentences are easy, but they show no *gradation* in proportion to the period of study. In summing up the points on the two papers, I find that the more advanced paper involves five case constructions, a purpose clause, a condition, and indirect discourse; while the more *elementary* paper involves five equally complex case constructions, a purpose clause, a condition, indirect discourse, and also a temporal clause, a result clause, and an indirect question. What, therefore, constitutes

Elementary Composition? Where is the mystic line beyond which lies Advanced Composition?

There is not sufficient time here to go deeply into the possible lines of division, but for mere illustration of the principle we may observe that it is obvious that for study previous to Cicero we could advantageously omit verbs governing the genitive case, complex passive constructions, idiomatic accusatives, expressions of value and price, independent subjunctives, commands and prohibitions (direct and quoted), all uses of the gerund and gerundive except those with *ad* and *causa*, conditional sentences (except the three normal types in direct discourse), and conditional clauses of comparison. There should be also a limit to the vast array of temporal, causal, and concessive conjunctions, and of substantive clauses. It is clear that great stress should be put upon purpose, result, indirect discourse (barring complex dependent clauses), questions direct and indirect, important case constructions, and particularly upon the principles of agreement. By laying stress upon just such selected points of syntax, and by drill in a selected vocabulary, tutors who make no effort to give a *course* in composition, but who attempt merely to cram the pupil for the immediate needs of the examination test succeed amazingly well in pushing boys into College. But no legitimate text-book on the market dares to suggest such a process. Certainly all who believe in the teaching of Latin as a language, and not as a piece of apparatus for gambling would welcome any move tending to make work in Latin composition a really progressive process, and one above all else thorough at every stage.

A word should be added regarding the requirements in grammar alone. The Secondary School teacher has fully enough on his hands in the work of the first two years if he teaches the regular inflections and syntax of frequent occurrence, without attempting to present satisfactorily much material which young pupils cannot comprehend, but which he *dares not omit*. Second year pupils do well if they absorb the fact that Latin is a highly inflected language, and that the word 'good', immutable in English, has in the Latin thirty forms, some spelled alike, to be sure. The mere assembling of the English meanings of a group of Latin words is all that some pupils can accomplish in translation for a long time after they begin the study of Latin; how much more true this must be of the reverse process, Latin composition!

Much is being said about the unit system. In this connection it is sufficient to observe that the requirements in text work may be quite in proportion to the credits awarded, but the requirements in composition are wholly out of proportion. As a general principle, for a college to *accept at all* Latin through Caesar and then to expect pupils of that stage to have a working knowledge of the general principles of Latin grammar, is foolishness at best. If the Secondary Schools can have a strict definition of what constitutes Second Year Latin, and a definite goal in the various stages of

composition work, they will have with a more definite purpose in view a corresponding reasonable hope of success.

LAWRENCEVILLE SCHOOL.

C. H. BREED.

REVIEWS

The Hellenica Oxyrhynchia: its Authorship and Authority. By E. M. Walker. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press (1913). Pp. 149. \$1.75.

The historian of Greece has at present no more puzzling problems to solve than those set by the Hellenica Oxyrhynchia, and he cannot go out of their way if he views his work seriously. Without taking account of details, they are two in number: first, the problem of the authorship of this notable historical fragment, and, second, the question of its value.

The papyrus on which it is written is of course anonymous. The writing was done in a country-town in Egypt in the third century of our era. This fact establishes a presumption, which, on a little reflection, we may convert into a fair certainty, that the author was a standard authority; hence, beyond a doubt, an historian of eminence. Since he lived in the half century following 395 B. C. (see next sentence), it ought, therefore, to be possible for us to ascertain his name. The work to which the fragment belongs contained a detailed narrative, interrupted by many excursuses, of events in Greece and Asia Minor in the years 396 and 395 B. C. It is commonly believed that it was a continuation of Thucydides and covered the period from 411 to 394 B. C. This, however, as Mr. Walker points out, is mainly an assumption. We cannot say with any assurance when the work began. All we know about its ending is that it cannot have occurred after 346 B. C.

For reasons which were, to say the least, far from conclusive, the claims of Ephorus to be considered its author were ruled out by the first editors; whereupon the controversy settled down into a struggle between the advocates and the opponents of Theopompus. The advocates of Theopompus, conspicuous among whom stand Wilamowitz, Eduard Meyer, Schwartz, Wilcken, and Busolt, have had to contend with the difficulties, (1) that in style and attitude the author of the fragment reveals a very different Theopompus from the one whom we have hitherto known on the joint authority of ancient report and extant fragments; (2) that it becomes necessary to assume that Theopompus was the main, if not the only, source from which Ephorus drew for his knowledge of this period; (3) that, far from plagiarizing Xenophon, as a passage from Porphyry gave us warrant for believing (*πολλὰ τοῦ Ξενοφώντος αὐτὸν μετατιθέμενα κατελήφα*), Theopompus was quite independent of Xenophon, so independent, in fact, that Busolt makes him an historical charlatan bent primarily, not on telling the truth but on 'going one better' than Xenophon, whose history he was striving to discredit and oust from popular favor.

These difficulties Wilamowitz, Meyer, and the others do not blink, but they do not find them serious. They say that we really know nothing of the youthful Theopompus, the author of the *Hellenica*; that the Theophrastus of the acrimonious temper and the impetuous style is the author of the *Philippica*, which was written when his style, like that of Carlyle in his maturity, had become personal, and his political and moral convictions had become fixed. They argue that you may assume that Theopompus (377-376—ca. 300 B. C.) wrote his *Hellenica* as early as 356 or at least before 346 and that Ephorus wrote about the events of 395 B. C. not much, if any earlier than 350 B. C., and possibly as late as the last quarter of the fourth century. The accusation of plagiarism is met by affirming that only in the one passage cited—that narrating the encounter between Agesilaus and Pharnabazus in the winter of 395-394 B. C.—did Theopompus use Xenophon, the reason for this exceptional practice being that of this encounter Xenophon was the only literary witness.

The difficulties of the opponents of Theopompus resolve themselves simply into the task of finding anyone else who suits the conditions of being approximately contemporary and at the same time a standard authority. Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, on editing the papyrus, considered the claims of Cratippus, whom Blass had proposed to them; and for this mysterious person the author of the book under review made a vigorous plea in a well-known article in *Klio* (1908), 356 ff., and Beloch, it seems, is about to make another. The main trouble with Cratippus, however, is that we cannot be sure that he wrote before 346 B. C., or was a contemporary in the necessary sense of that term; and that we cannot be sure that the kind of work he wrote was a history such as we have before us in the fragment from Oxyrhynchus. The fragment might as well be anonymous as belong to Cratippus.

At present the most formidable competitor of Theopompus is beyond all doubt Ephorus himself, whom Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt and those whom they consulted before editing the papyrus disposed of too summarily. The idea that he must be more seriously reckoned with was first stated by W. A. Bauer; his case was first pleaded by Judeich. The present book is a critical examination of Judeich's brief which resulted in strengthening and elaborating its arguments. It is a splendid example of English workmanship at its best and may be commended to all and sundry as a model of sound reasoning, scholarly competency, and masterly presentation. I hasten to add that I have been convinced of the correctness of its main thesis.

Mr. Walker deals first with the assumptions which have hitherto prejudiced the case against Ephorus: (1) that the scale of the fragment is too great for an universal history, and (2) that Ephorus, according to Diodorus, wrote topically (*τῶν γὰρ βιβλίων ἐκαστην περιέχειν κατὰ γένος τὰς πράξεις* . . .). By an elaborate calculation Walker shows that Ephorus, in the part of his work which concerned the first

quarter of the fourth century B. C., included the events of four or five years in an average book: Book 18, for example, began with the despatch of Thimbron to Asia in 400-399 and ended with the recall of Agesilaus in the spring of 394 B. C.; that one of his books may have had as many as 4000 lines of Teubner text, and that the papyrus fragment, if completed on scale, would have covered the period from 399 to 394 B. C. in an equal number of lines. Mr. Walker refuses to agree with Judeich that Ephorus did not write topically; his eighteenth book, for instance, had as its topic the Spartan crusade against the Persians. What he does assert, and, as it seems to me, establish conclusively, is that a topical arrangement of the subject by books permits a synchronistic arrangement of the material within a book. Moreover, by an analysis of Diodorus, he shows that Ephorus did, as a matter of fact, arrange his material synchronistically in Book 18. Further, he gives weighty reasons for the conclusion that this synchronistic arrangement of the material was precisely the one followed by the papyrus. With this argument he passes from the position that Ephorus is a possible author for the fragment to the positive one, that he is, in fact, *the* author. His strongest point in favor of this position is that the papyrus is embedded, often without verbal change, in Diodorus in so obvious a way that we are bound to conclude one of two things: either the papyrus is Diodorus's source, Ephorus, or Ephorus was an equally slavish and mechanical transcriber of his source, the papyrus, as was Diodorus himself. Hence, if the author represented by the papyrus is Theopompus, we have to recast completely our conception not only of Theophrastus but also of Ephorus. This, however, is intolerable. The force of this reasoning Mr. Walker increases by showing that the style of the fragment is exactly what we have long since discovered that of Ephorus to be; that the papyrus has the same interest in Central Greece and Asia Minor that is evident in Ephorus, and that its author took the same Mugwump view of politics that Ephorus did.

With the second great problem raised by the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*—that of the value of its materials—Mr. Walker deals less exhaustively; and now as before the one great work on this theme is Meyer's *Theopomps Hellenica*. The conclusion as to authorship reached by Walker has, however, important bearings upon the time of composition of Ephorus's history (it was left unfinished at the year 357-356 B. C. on account of the author's death at ca. 350 B. C. After Ephorus's death his son completed the account of the last generation, the 25th from the Return of the Heraclidae [1091 B. C.], which, beginning as it did with the battle of Leuctra in 371, had to end rather abruptly in 341 B. C.); it has important bearings, too, upon its relationship, rather, lack of relationship, to Xenophon's *Hellenica* (the two histories were being written at the same time and neither author knew the other's work), and upon its character.

Into the details of the two final chapters of Mr. Walker's book, on the Credibility of the Narrative, lack of space forbids me to enter. His place is in general with Eduard Meyer, for he is convinced that Ephorus, if we may now give the author of the papyrus his name, has to be seriously reckoned with even when he comes into conflict with Xenophon. He says rather pessimistically:

It is not the least important result of the literary finds of the last quarter of a century that we are beginning to realize that our certitude in regard to the details of Ancient History is largely an illusion. The great historians have gone uncontradicted, because there was commonly no other authority, of at all the same rank, with which to confront them. But where comparison was possible divergencies and contradictions were at once apparent.

Thucydides contradicts Herodotus; Aristotle contradicts both of them and Xenophon as well; now Ephorus contradicts, and contradicts very flatly, Xenophon. What are we to do about it? This question historians of Greece may answer differently: they cannot afford to shirk it.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

W. S. FERGUSON.

Ancient Eugenics (the Arnold Prize Essay for 1913).

By A. G. Roper. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell (1913). 76 pp.

In one form or another, eugenics is perhaps as old as babies, but as a science it can hardly be traced back of Sir Francis Galton, who laid the foundations a half century ago and first applied the term in 1884. The researches of a eugenist among our classical authors might, therefore, be expected to result in some novel finds and in an especially illuminating treatment of the material. Unfortunately this book is by no means exhaustive, nor even sufficient to satisfy the ordinary investigator into the life of the ancients. Reference to such accessible works as Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer*, 1. 3, 82-83, and Daremberg et Saglio, s. v. *expositio*, not to speak of others, would have acquainted its author with passages too important to overlook. On the other hand, the writer's point of view is responsible for an interesting and suggestive book.

Following an excellent Introduction, in which he theorizes about the usages among prehistoric savages and traces the general development of eugenic ideas, Mr. Roper conducts the reader to his selection of Latin passages. These concern almost exclusively times long after Aristotle, with whom he is later to bring his account of Greek eugenics practically to completion. Christianity's abolition of infanticide is the chief differential factor between the old eugenics and the new. While the pagan would unhesitatingly end the existence of the child he deemed unfit to live, we prolong the life of even the obviously useless. Infanticide, indeed, spared the Greeks many of the problems of heredity with which we are wrestling as yet almost hopelessly, because, as the essayist frankly states, our actual knowledge is for practical, constructive purposes hardly

greater than that of Plato. The crucial trouble, the fact that the possession of a *corpus sanum*, the ultimate aim of the eugenist, does not insure the possession of a *mens sana* is still to be faced and will perhaps exist forever. Productivity and mental and moral superiority are scarcely commensurate.

While the reviewer approached his task with a strong desire to pass a favorable judgment, he has been shocked to find among the rather limited references that the author gives such a formidable number of errors as to suggest inevitably not only carelessness but also a dependence upon secondary sources for the material used. Thus, we should read on page 12, note 4, ii. 15, and, in note 5, i. 15.2; on p. 13, note 3, x. 33; on p. 17, note 2, 555 c; on p. 21, note 1, 276 d. On p. 19 in note 1 the 37 might be omitted. The 553 c is incorrect on p. 22, note 3. On p. 30 in note 1 the 20 should be replaced by vii. 2. 3. Note 9 of p. 33 also has a wrong reference and there are others.

It is not safe to say (p. 13) that "Quintilian declared that the exposed rarely survived" on the strength of "Dec." ccvi. 6, since this *Declamatio* may never have even met his eye. Even if one could accept the conclusions drawn from Pliny's boast (p. 14: "for 600 years Rome had known no doctors"), the figures given need rectification in the light of what he really says in his H. N. 29. (6) 12, and chronology forbids us to believe that "Aratus voices again the lament of Horace" (15). Xenophon does not speak of Sparta as having the smallest population in Greece (23). It was Epigenes and not Epigones (39) that vexed Socrates. *Kratesickleia* (19) might sick-en both those who represent kappa by a *k* and those who prefer the *c*, but in this matter the book is repeatedly at fault. Greek words, too, are spelled or accented wrongly. The reviewer would like a reference for the statements that "the Indians . . . offer up children to Moloch (the Semitic God!) . . . the Carthaginians sacrifice them to Kronos", on page 8 (Diodorus Siculus 20. 14. 6 states that the Carthaginians sacrificed children to Kronos; but his identification of Moloch with Kronos is absurd). The allegation (9) that "among the Prussians the aged and infirm, the sick and deformed, were unhesitatingly put to death", was important enough even before the war to deserve a reference to the evidence, but this is only one of a number of statements for which the source is not given. The last sentences on page 25 represent a conflatus of Xenophon *De Rep. Lac.* 1.10 and 5.9, but Mr. Roper has not rendered the former passage correctly. The first note on page 55 is not an adequate reference to a work that is divided into three books.

If some of these errors might lead one to suppose that the graduate of Oxford who received at the hands of the Regius Professor of Modern History, the Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History and the Camden Professor of Ancient History the high honor and financial reward of the Arnold Prize was somewhat deficient in Greek and Latin, he needs to read but a few pages to dispel his doubts. Only a classicist could use so

familiarly such words as non-viable, dichotomize, deliquescent, stiripiculture, biometry, aggeneration, unigeniture, dysgenic and entelechy, but I humbly submit that one sentence on page 53, "From the fantastic laconism of the Republic and the visionary parenthesis of the Politicus we pass to the palinode of disillusioned senility, the Laws", is a *monstrum* which according to the practice mentioned by Seneca, *De Ira* 1. 15.2, should be 'merged'.

The only other passage that makes an equally unfortunate impression is on page 21, where I am sure that even a pretty good Hellenist would need the help of several references not given, and would recognize "bouagor" better than 'buagor'. Moreover, while this personage and the ilarch might possibly be spoken of as having bureaucratic control, why should the melliran be linked with them? Merely because of age (Krause, *Die Gymnastik und Agonistik der Hellenen* 1. 278)? But Grasberger, *Erziehung und Unterricht*, 3. 58-59, is correct on this.

Mr. Roper's treatment of eugenics among the Greeks is naturally more detailed, and we find valuable interpretations and reflections as well as useful references to the more recent literature, the papers delivered at the Eugenics Congress and other publications that are available in our larger libraries. After discussing the ideas and practices of the Spartans, Cretans, Carthaginians and Germans, he takes up the sporadic passages in the early Greek poets that concern his subject, and then, at some length, Euripides. From Xenophon's *Memorabilia* he extracts the oral teachings of Socrates as a preliminary to his study of the opinions of his pupils Critias and Plato. The latter's indebtedness to the Spartan system is duly emphasized. Lastly comes Aristotle, and in him we find no merely academic discussion of the problems of birth, marriage, etc., as they affect an ideal state, but an effort to propose a plan of social reform that would really 'work' at Athens. Since Mr. Roper holds that in him culminates the history of ancient eugenics, he refers only briefly to later philosophers, and after alluding to the modern vagaries of More's *Utopia*, Campanella's *City of the Sun*, etc., he closes with this admirable summary: So Eugenics, ruthlessly practised in those distant ages, "when wild in wood the noble savage ran", rudely systematized, passed into the constitution of Sparta. The selfish creed of a warrior caste, even in the hands of Plato and Aristotle it never lost its parochialism, and when this narrow spirit gave way before the cosmopolitanism of subsequent philosophy, individualism, isolating human effort from a world rational only to the evolutionist, effectually checked the growth of the Eugenic ideal for centuries.

UNIVERSITY OF
PENNSYLVANIA.

WALTON BROOKS McDANIEL.

The Kings of Lydia, and a Rearrangement of Some Fragments from Nicolaus of Damascus. Princeton Doctoral Dissertation, accepted June, 1911. By Leigh Alexander (1913). Pp. 61.

This treatise is a product of the interest in the country of Lydia inspired at Princeton University by the excavations at Sardis, and seeks to systematize our knowledge of the kings of that land. The sources are mainly the first book of Herodotus, the fragments of Xanthus's *Lydiaca*, and some fragments of the *Universal History* of Nicolaus of Damascus, with certain lists of the kings in the Christian chronographers.

In the first chapter, Dr. Alexander examines the order and assignment to books of the fragments of Nicolaus, Books 1-8, so far as they come to us in the *Excerpta de Virtutibus et Vitiis*, and in the *Excerpta de Insidiis*, prepared for the Emperor Constantinus Porphyrogenitus. He accepts Müller's arrangement for the former, as given in the *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* 3. 345 ff., 356 ff., but for the fragments coming from the *De Insidiis* he proposes a slightly different order and assignment, which enables us to adopt the view that the excerpts for both collections were made in the same manner—an eminently reasonable supposition. The importance of this rearrangement for Dr. Alexander is that all the passages bearing on Lydia are seen now to come from two sections of Nicolaus, the first part of the fourth book and the middle of the seventh book, instead of from three separate books. Manifestly, this is important for the relative chronology of the kings mentioned in the passages.

In the second chapter there is a discussion of the three persons named Meles, one mentioned in Herodotus, the other two in Nicolaus's fragments. The conclusion reached is that the three are really identical, and that this Meles was a usurper, probably toward the end of the reign of the first Ardys, and that he was driven out by Moxos (a general, not a king), supposedly to Babylon. Seemingly he got back again into power, only to be expelled permanently; and a report was circulated that he was responsible for the assassination of the first Daskylos.

In the third chapter Dr. Alexander examines the various lists of kings and draws up a new stemma. The names Sadyattes, Adyattes, and Alyattes appear used of the same persons, and are evidently merely different forms of the same word; and, as this appellation is given not only to most of the kings, but even to kings for whom another name is presented, it is likely that this was either a name common in the royal family, borne frequently in addition to another name, or was a title belonging equally to all the Lydian kings, as indeed was suggested by Radet, *La Lydie et le monde grec au temps des Mermnades*, 77-78. Then, by a series of careful identifications of names differing not too greatly, Dr. Alexander constructs his new stemma, with nine kings. First, in the line of the Tylonii or Heracleidae, we have an Adyattes whose special name is not recorded, Akiamos or Ardys, Myrsos, and Kandaules. Kandaules was murdered and was succeeded by Gyges, son of Daskylos, as is related by Herodotus. The remaining kings belong to the line of the Mermnadae or Dascylii: Gyges, already mentioned; the second Ardys; Kam-

bles; Adramytes; and Croesus, who lost his throne before the Persian power in 546 B. C. In each dynasty the succession runs from father to son.

In the orthography of the proper names the reviewer has followed the inconsistent usage of the text. But why Zethos and Cypselus, Aegisthus and Aipytos, Korinthos and Corinth, all on page 15? and why consistently Herakles and Herakleid, but Heracleidae, especially on page 55, where all three words occur in lines 3-5? We have a right to demand a consistent practice of some sort. Yet otherwise the work seems well done, the proof reading careful, and the argumentation sound. The treatise fills its appointed place in the reconstruction of the sadly shattered edifice of Lydian history.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

ROLAND G. KENT.

CAESAR'S BRIDGE AND THE MODERN OFFENSIVE-DEFENSIVE STRATEGY

Among the many interesting parallels drawn by various writers between methods of warfare in Caesar's time and those employed to-day in the European War, I have not seen any mention of the striking analogy to be found in connection with Caesar's famous bridge across the Rhine. The resemblances already noted have reference largely to matters of tactics; the parallel here is one of strategy. Most young students, I believe, feel a distinct sense of surprise and disappointment when, after struggling through the details of Caesar's engineering in the construction of the bridge, they read in the next chapter but one that after a stay beyond the Rhine of only eighteen days Caesar withdrew into Gaul *pontemque rescidit*. It seems a great deal of trouble thrown away. Is not their surprise due to a lack of understanding of Caesar's generalship, the nature of which becomes particularly clear in the light of the offensive-defensive strategy of which so much has been said in the present war? In modern warfare, the military experts tell us, the only true defensive is an offensive. This seeming paradox is illustrated in every field of military operations. So for instance we read in recent dispatches of the Austrians engaging in a new offensive in Bukowina in order to relieve the pressure in the Carpathians and to ward off the threatened invasion of Hungary. And even so large a movement as the German invasion of Poland is, we are told, no real offensive having in view a serious conquest in Russia, but simply a defensive, calculated to delay or repel the Russian invasion of Germany.

So with Caesar's bridge. That the building of the bridge and the brief campaign that followed was a true offensive-defensive piece of strategy in the modern sense is shown clearly enough in Caesar's own account of his motives. In Chapter 16 of Book IV he says of the reasons which impelled him to cross the Rhine: *quarum illa fuit iustissima, quod, cum videret Germanos tam facile impelli ut in Galliam venirent, suis quoque rebus eos timere voluit, cum intellegent et posse et audere populi Romani exercitum Rhenum transire (compare ut Germanis metum iniceret, Chapter 19). This passage is strikingly illuminated by recent events in Europe, which again bear testimony to the far-seeing military genius of Caesar.*

Born almost at the very hour of the terrible Germanic invasion of 102 and 101 B.C., and no doubt nurtured

on tales of the campaigns of his kinsman, Marius, against the Cimbri and the Teutones, Caesar seems to have grown up with a sense of the danger from the North, which persisted as a dominant influence in determining the policy of his ripe manhood. In a large view may not the whole of Caesar's campaigns in Gaul be justly regarded as one great piece of offensive-defensive strategy designed to protect Rome's empire from the Northern Barbarians? How well it succeeded all subsequent history bears witness.

THE LAUREL SCHOOL,
Cleveland.

E. FRANCIS CLAFLIN.

THE WAR AND THE CLASSICS

Apropos of several brief notes that have appeared in recent issues of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY in which mention is made of certain phases of the present war which recall Caesar's campaigns in Gaul, it seems worth while to call attention to an interesting parallel between present European conditions and an incident related in another Latin historical work. The book in question is the Gothic History of Jordanes, so notable for its account of the world struggle decided on the Catalaunian Plains in 451.

The Literary Digest of March 6, 1915, under the heading The War and the Birds, gives some extracts from an article by E. Trouessart in La Nature (Paris, January 16), entitled The Influence of the War on the Fauna of the Country and on the Migrations of the Birds. I quote a brief paragraph:

"A skilful observer who knows the migrations of birds very well, Mr. Petit, senior, being on August 24—at the time of the battle of Charleroi—at Blanc-Mesnil, in the department of Seine-et-Oise, saw two flocks, each of twenty storks, pass at ten minutes' interval from east to west. From another side we are informed that in November a stork was seen to fall into one of the streets of the city of Orleans. All these birds were considerably out of the ordinary line of migration."

This calls to mind at once the similar account given by Jordanes of a change in the habits of storks, occasioned by the havoc of war during the siege of Aquileia in 452. Attila had been unable to overcome the desperate resistance of the Romans, despite a long and vigorous assault (Getica 42.220). The passage continues thus (220-221):

"At last his army was discontented and eager to withdraw. Attila chanced to be walking around the walls, considering whether to break camp or delay longer, and noticed that the white birds, namely, the storks, who build their nests in the gables of houses, were bearing their young from the city and, contrary to their custom, were carrying them out into the country. Being a shrewd observer of events, he understood this and said to his soldiers: 'You see the birds foresee the future. They are leaving the city sure to perish and are forsaking strongholds doomed to fall by reason of imminent peril. Do not think this a meaningless or uncertain sign; fear, arising from the things they foresee, has changed their custom'. Why say more? He inflamed the hearts of his soldiers to attack Aquileia again. Constructing battering rams and bringing to bear all manner of engines of war, they quickly forced their way into the city, laid it waste, divided the spoil and so cruelly devastated it as scarcely to leave a trace to be seen."

PRINCETON
UNIVERSITY.

CHARLES CHRISTOPHER MIEROW.